



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2026 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002992

42 Painter Wood, Whalley Old Road, Billington, Lancashire BB7 9JD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr. & Mrs. Simon Howarth against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 3/2025/0818.
 - The application sought planning permission for "Single storey extensions to side and rear. Alterations to fenestration." without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref. 3/2020/0163, dated 29 April 2020.
 - The condition in dispute is No. 2 which states that:
"The permission shall relate to the development as shown on Plan Reference: Location Plan Scale 1:1250; Proposed elevation Plan A202; Proposed Section Plan A204; Proposed Garage Floor Plan A207; Proposed Floor Plan A202."
 - The reason given for the condition is:
"For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted plans."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for "Single storey extensions to side and rear. Alterations to fenestration." at 42 Painter Wood, Whalley Old Road, Billington, Lancashire BB7 9JD in accordance with the application Ref. 3/2025/0818, without compliance with condition No. 2 previously imposed on planning permission Ref. 3/2020/0163 dated 29 April 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan Scale 1:1250; Existing and Proposed Elevations Front A300; Proposed Section Plan A204; Proposed Garage Floor Plan A207; Proposed Floor Plan A202.
 - 2) Precise specifications or samples of walling and roofing materials and details of any surface materials to be used including their colour and texture shall have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before their use in the proposed works.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Background and Main Issue

3. Planning permission was granted in 2020 for single storey extensions to the side and rear and alterations to the fenestration, subject to conditions including condition No. 2, which specifies the approved plans. The appeal proposal seeks to vary this to substitute a plan to replace the white render finish of the front balcony wall with Corten steel cladding. The main issue is the effect that varying the condition, and the addition of the cladding as opposed to white render, would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow positioned on elevated land. Its front elevation incorporates a mix of render, timber cladding and stone and it sits within a row of detached dwellings which also feature a mixed material palette.
5. Whilst the proposed finish would introduce a new material and colour to the front elevation, it would integrate well with the mix of existing materials already featured on the host dwelling. Properties along Whalley Old Road also display a similarly diverse range of materials that include red hanging tiles, red brick, a red steel door and zinc cladding. In this context, the proposed Corten steel cladding would sit comfortably within this existing variety, reflecting both the use of metal elements and the red toned finishes along the road. Given its placement to a small area within the broad front elevation, it would also appear as a modest and inconspicuous feature, even when accounting for the property's elevated siting.
6. As no harm is found on the main issue, the lack of an amendment for an alternative material is not determinative. The proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. As such, it would not conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy 2008 - 2028 or Paragraph 140 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek for, amongst other things, a high standard of building design and to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion.

Conditions

7. As a consequence of allowing this appeal, condition No. 2 would include the amended plan, in the interests of precision and clarity. The time limit condition is not necessary since, bar the change to the balcony, the remainder of the original development has been completed. As I have no information before me about the status of condition No. 3 imposed on the original planning permission, I have included it. In the event that it has been discharged, that is a matter which can be addressed by the main parties.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. I recommend that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the stated conditions, given it would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR